

**LLOYD WISE****- 1 FEB 2005****RECEIVED****PATENT COOPERATION TREATY****10/526169****Rec'd PCT/PTO 24 FEB 2005**

To:

WATKIN Timothy Lawrence  
Lloyd Wise  
Tanjong Pagar P O Box 636  
Singapore 910816

**PCT****WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing 24 January 2005 (24.01.2005)  
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
FP2241

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/SG 2004/000109

International filing date (day/month/year)  
26 April 2004 (26.04.2004)

Priority Date (day/month/year)  
-----

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
G06F 12/14, G06F 13/12, G06F 13/00, H04L 9/00

Applicant

**TREK 2000 INTERNATIONAL LTD**

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Cont. No. I Basis of the opinion  
☐ Cont. No. II Priority  
☐ Cont. No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability  
☐ Cont. No. IV Lack of unity of invention  
☒ Cont. No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement  
☐ Cont. No. VI Certain documents cited  
☐ Cont. No. VII Certain defects in the international application  
☐ Cont. No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

**2. FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ AT  
**Austrian Patent Office**  
Dresdner Straße 87, A-1200 Vienna  
Facsimile No. +43 / 1 / 534 24 / 535

Authorized officer  
**KÖGL C.**  
Telephone No. +43 / 1 / 534 24 / 440

**Continuation No. I**

**Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed.

**Continuation No. V**

**Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims 1-30	YES
	Claims ----	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 1-30	YES
	Claims ----	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-30	YES
	Claims ----	NO

**2. Citations and explanations:**

The following documents are mentioned in the International Search Report; the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure:

**D1:** US 6 003 135  
US 6 460 138 B1  
2003/0217206 A1  
917 913

**D2:**  
**D3:** US  
**D4:** US 5

Document **D1** discloses a portable memory device to communicate with a host computer device to enable one or more security operations to be performed by the modular device. The document **D1** is considered to represent the most relevant document. **D1** shows in Fig. 3A a modular device (Position 302) with a security module (Position 302a) in which the interface section of the application is equivalent to the communication interface (Fig. 3A, Position 303). Position 611 (**D1**: Fig. 6) shows a processing device of the security module which is equivalent to the 'master control unit' in the present application. The non-volatile data storage device will be shown in **D1** as well (Column 19, Lines 39-40). The integrated chip (document **D1**: Column 19, Line 32) is an indication of an 'integrated circuit' described in **Claim 1** of the present application. **D1** shows different key operations (e.g. Column 21, Line 30 or Line 58), hash operation (Column 21, Line 35), digital signature (Column 21, Line 40), data encryption (Column 21, Line 52), one or more public keys (Column 21, Line 58) and a biometric module (Column 18, Line 18) as well. The present application comprises the follow features 'integrated circuit means for generating at least one key, the

device being arranged, upon receiving a command from a host requesting data ...' which are not shown in **D1**. Therefore the present application teaches small but favourable improvements in respect of the prior art.

The cited publication **D2** describes a user authentication for portable electronic devices including a non-volatile memory (Fig.2, Position 122) allowing the user to gain access. **D2** does not show e.g. an integrated circuit or a host. **D2** describes a standard technology.

The document **D3** refers to a portable memory device with a data connection to a host via a universal serial bus (USB). The user connects the portable device to a host platform. The portable device is connected to the host and the portable device undergo an initialisation procedure. The host platform requests services from the portable device by sending request packets to the USB host controller. The USB host controller transmits packets through the USB port (= interface section) to the USB connector. **D3** does not use any key operation. Therefore **D3** describes a prior art as well. **D4** relates to a portable electronic authorization device and methods therefore. This Document shows a transaction request of a portable electronic authorization device. **D4** shows the general state of the art.

Summarizing, the subject matter of **Claims 1-30** is novel over prior art and does involve an inventive step. The cited documents **D1-D4** show the general state of the art which is not considered to be of a particular relevance.

The industrial applicability is obvious given.

---